

Proposed Major Development in Normandy: Analysis of September 2025 Survey Results

Context

In July 2025 Taylor Wimpey held its first public engagement event regarding its proposed major housing development in Normandy. Very few details were made available at that time, but it was clear the proposal would involve the building of hundreds of houses on the Green Belt land lying at the heart of Normandy, between Glaziers and Westwood Lanes, the railway line, and the A323 Guildford Road.

To get a sense of how people in the village felt about such a proposal, we asked those on our mailing list to complete a very simple online questionnaire. The survey ran from the end of August to early October, and we had 336 responses. NB this was before the publication in October of the developer's EIA Scoping Request, which gave greater detail of the developer's intentions,

The Questions

We asked the following questions:

1. In principle, would you be for or against several hundred homes being built on this site?
 - a. For
 - b. Against
 - c. Undecided
2. If you are in favour, what would be the main benefits as you see them (check all that apply):
 - a. Need for more housing in the area
 - b. Likely improvements to infrastructure e.g. roads and sewerage
 - c. Additional community facilities
 - d. Improved access to green spaces
 - e. Inclusion of one or more school
 - f. Improvements to public transport
 - g. Other (open text)
3. If you are against, what are your main objections (check all that apply):
 - a. Doubling the size and destroying the character of Normandy
 - b. Loss of historic green space at the heart of the village
 - c. Increased risk of flooding
 - d. Habitat and biodiversity loss
 - e. Lack of faith in claimed infrastructure improvements
 - f. Additional strain on local services, e.g. health
 - g. Other (open text)
4. What further information might help you to decide whether to support or oppose? (open text)
5. Is there anything else you would like to say? (open text)
6. Please enter your email address below. If you haven't yet subscribed to our mailing list, please consider doing so at <https://normandyag.org.uk/follow-us> Thanks!

The Responses

The responses to the first three questions are shown in the attached pdf. In summary:

317 respondents, (94.3%) were against the proposals;

18 (5.4%) were undecided, and to show that this survey was not run along the lines of an election in North Korea:

1 (0.3%) was in favour.

The main **reasons for objection** were: doubling the size and destroying the character of Normandy: 309 (92.0%); additional strain on local services e.g. health 303 (90.2%); loss of historic green space at the heart of the village 296 (88.1%); habitat and biodiversity loss 294 (87.5%) – but all answers scored above 80%. These responses were complemented by 331 open text answers to question 4. The sheer volume of these makes it hard to summarise them, but some typical comments were:

- “This development would completely destroy the heart of our village. I understand houses need to be built but most tend to be done on the outskirts of existing towns and villages, not on green fields, full of nature, completely centrally. It will, without a doubt, change the character and look of the place where we've chosen to live.”
- “Situated between two minor roads in an area that floods. Why would you build there?”
- “Flooding has been a significant concern in Normandy for many years and taking away land will make this worse.”
- “Years of development will blight Normandy and its residents. The infrastructure will be strained beyond breaking point and the upgrading of roads serving the site being developed will introduce significant additional conservation and disruptive issues to areas well away from the housing development. Even if the road network is improved the huge increase of vehicular traffic will cause considerable negative issues on a daily basis at the point where traffic will bottleneck further along the road network.”
- “We need to stop this.”
- “Nothing could change my mind as to the proposed plan. I am thoroughly against the proposal.”
- “This is total overload and would have a very negative impact on Normandy, its infrastructure and facilities”
- “This is not at all in keeping with the rest of the village: the current infrastructure cannot support a development of this size, and this will have a significant negative impact on the existing residents living in the village.”
- “A likely additional 2000 cars and extra traffic movements associated with the schools would completely change the character of the area as well as increasing pollution and contributing to climate change.”
- “In my experience the fields here are waterlogged and extremely muddy from roughly late October through to April. I would politely invite anyone at Taylor Wimpey to spend some time here in the winter, to understand how bad it is and see how terrible it would be for building.”
- “Ridiculous amount of extra traffic on narrow roads. Glaziers Lane with the bridge and Westwood Lane with single file traffic under the bridge. Also, turning into Glaziers Lane from Guildford Road is awkward. Flooding is a serious problem. Virtually doubling the size of the village without infrastructure is ludicrous.”

- "Nothing can make this plan suitable for Normandy; it's a village, this building plan will remove that status forever. We are already under huge strain on the road system, more buses and cars, delivery lorries and vans will ruin so many things. You need to find a more suitable place to build."
- "The development of a site of such magnitude would fundamentally destroy the character of Normandy. It would become part of an urban sprawl linking Guildford and Aldershot and no longer a semi-rural community."
- "No further information needed. I will never support the village being ruined by this development. Wholly oppose this plan on every level."
- "As there are approximately one or two cars per home, this proposed new development should produce a minimum of 1,000 to 1,500 extra cars in a small area, and the roads on either side - especially Westwood Lane and the railway arch leading into Beech Lane - would be totally unable to cope with this extra influx especially during early morning and evening, causing total traffic chaos."
- "We haven't had any new GPs following huge developments in Ash and Tongham. Our medical facilities are under pressure, especially with the government pushing more care into the community."
- "We just need to stop all this overdevelopment of this part of Surrey. Ash and Tongham have borne the brunt of it, and this area can't take any more."
- "The size of the planned area for development is totally disproportionate when considered alongside the existing size of the village."
- "I also do not believe they will be providing 50% affordable homes. The median wage can borrow £160,000 in this area. Does this mean that they want to build 550 one bed flats? In high rises?"
- "We have a community hub with the cafe and shop plus three halls for entertainment: we do not need anything else."
- "The current farmland and woodlands are absolutely stunning and full of wildlife. It's difficult to see how even minimal development could be integrated into the surroundings."
- "Everything about this development is a no-no. Nothing further can help me change my view."
- "The promise of infrastructure to go with the planning application would not be upheld. The same promises were made on the Wildflower Meadow near the Ash station...and on the houses built near Ash Lodge Drive...the infrastructure never came."
- "I cannot stress enough just how much I oppose this development. Nobody is asking for this, it will change our lives forever and have detrimental impacts on my family's quality of life forever."
- "Schools, medical centres, Royal Surrey and Frimley Hospitals are already overstretched."
- "Don't need any further information bad idea full stop not the right place for such a development."
- "No further information will change my mind. Dead against the Taylor Wimpey building proposal."
- "The public consultation felt as though it was solely a tick box exercise for the purposes of being able to say that they have engaged with the public."
- "Already overstretched GP surgery. Traffic at the school is terrible. No pedestrian crossing which makes it very dangerous to cross. Extra houses means extra cars."
- "This is farmland not 'grey belt'"

- "How many build out phases does TW envisage? If housing market conditions deteriorate further, in spite of planning permission being given, might the build out stop halfway through or even never start?"
- "Please no more houses, no more cars; we must keep green spaces, as when they are gone they are gone for ever."
- "I believe that the developers have vastly underestimated the amount of vehicles that this development will generate. Along with Westwood Lane, the A323 will need to be seriously upgraded between Ash and Guildford to cope with the additional traffic."
- "I do not have words to describe how I feel about this proposed development other than it is fundamentally wrong for the area."
- "We are custodians of this wonderful space, we also have a duty to secure all aspects of wildlife, as it is unable to defend itself, for all future generations to enjoy."
- "Schools are not required, local schools all undersubscribed. A new food shop would result in closure of our existing shop and cafe. We don't need any new community centres. We have more than enough already."
- "More houses, more cars, more people, more congestion, more background noise, more light pollution, less wildlife, less trees, less peace etc. Not good!"
- "Traditional hay meadows, which most of this land is, is an important and overlooked wildlife and biodiversity resource (often completely ignored and lost in favour of tree planting)."
- "People have to live somewhere. The proposed development is out of all proportion with the size of the current village with the inevitable destruction of its character. A much smaller development, sensitively planned to fit the landscape and vernacular building style would be understood. There are plenty of examples of this but this does not seem to be what TW have in mind. A growth of, say, 10% or around 100 properly designed lower density houses would probably not kill off the whole idea of Normandy as a community, but even this would provide extra strain on the environment and support services."

The **one vote in favour** was from someone who no longer lives in Normandy and claimed that the proposals would "Improve a very outdated village that has had no new development".

A number of those who said they were **undecided** along with some who were **against** also answered question 2, mainly on the basis that, were the development to go ahead, there were things that they would wish to see as part of it, or areas where they would want to see clearer evidence from the developer. Some also made similar comments in response to question 4. The following is a summary of these questions/concerns:

Guaranteed Improvements to Infrastructure and Local Services

- Concrete plans for infrastructure improvements and how they would be delivered, not just vague promises;
- Guarantees of flood mitigation, and infrastructure improvements paid for up front before any building started.
- A confirmed list of what facilities were definitely being proposed;
- Detailed plans of not just where the houses and facilities would be built but how traffic would be controlled and how congestion would be prevented.
- Upgrades to pedestrian and cycle routes, improvements to roads to reduce congestion, improvements to the train station, investment in the existing local facilities.

- 50% left for green space walks, well maintained cycle path into Guildford paid for by the developers;
- A bigger doctors' surgery.
- A gastro-type pub.

Appropriateness of scale

- Numbers greatly reduced to respect the openness of the Green Belt, the historic character of Normandy and the separate settlements, and a size, location, and design that reflected the established small scale, low density and organic growth of the village.
- Smaller developments in keeping with housing in Normandy rather than hundreds of houses;
- More properties needed, but of a decent quality and of the right types and not as many as the quantity proposed.

Mitigating Climate Harm and Biodiversity Loss

- Evidence of robust plans to mitigate further detrimental effects on the climate and biodiversity loss.
- Modern, energy efficient, housing, using sustainable materials and minimum carbon.

Wider local planning context

- Need for this development to be seen in the context of all other plans in the surrounding areas; proposal would be supported if it was the least worst place in the Local Plan.

Preventing creep

- Concern that if the development were limited to a smaller number of units, the developer would be able to argue its way out of infrastructure improvement liabilities on economic viability grounds. And that further developments would follow in subsequent years, but without any improvements to infrastructure because each development was able to argue that it would not be economically viable to do so.
- Danger that the developer would build on 50% of the land now and then in 5 years' time build on the other 50%;

Affordability and suitability of housing

- Concern about how much of the development would be affordable housing or share/buy so that local people such as young adults who have grown up in the Normandy area could afford to stay in the area.
- Up to 50 2-3 bedroom houses built close to the train station to facilitate car-free commuting to Guildford and priced for first home buyers to afford.
- A retirement complex included in the plans so elderly people could downsize but still live in the village.
- A smaller development of less than 60 homes, provided it included affordable homes for single people & young families.

Conclusion

The overwhelming majority of the responses was unequivocally against a development on this scale in Normandy. Most people said they were unlikely to be persuaded by anything the developer could put on the table by way of mitigation, but there was some support for a much smaller-scale development protecting the character of the village and its natural environment, and placing less strain on existing infrastructure and services, provided the houses constructed were truly affordable by young people.